

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/892,860	06/28/2001	Deonarine Phagoo	4320-292	3126
75	590 12/10/2002			
Stephen M. Beney Bereskin & Parr Box 401 40 King Street West Toronto, ON M5H 3Y2 CANADA		,	EXAMINER	
		, X	FORTUNA, ANA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1723	_
	' .		DATE MAILED: 12/10/2002	16
				مسر

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

mk	-	6
----	---	---

Application No. 09/892,860

Applicant(s)

Phagoo et al

Office Action Summary

Examiner Ana Fortuna

Art Unit 1723

			•.•	damaa addaaaa		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sh	eet with	the correspondence address		
Period for	or Reply DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET T	O EXPIRE	3	MONTH(S) FROM		
THE N	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no	event, however, r	nay a reply i	be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the		
- If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any rer	date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the seriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the sply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	application to beco	me ABAND	ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)[💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 28, 20	01		•		
2a) 🗌	This bottom to the tar	100 100 VIII				
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance exclosed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex part</i>	his application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposi	tion of Claims					
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u>			is/are pending in the application.		
2	(a) Of the above, claim(s)					
5)□				is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1-20			is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are objected to.		
8) 🗆	Claims	ar	e subjec	t to restriction and/or election requirement.		
- •	ation Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) 🗌 accept	ed or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.		
10/	Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr	awing(s) be h	eld in ab	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	i	s: a)□	approved b) \square disapproved by the Examine		
117	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examir					
,	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	• .				
13).	to all the state of a plain for foreign or	iority under :	35 U.S.(C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a)[\square All b) \square Some* c) \square None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have					
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been receiv	red in A	pplication No		
,s e	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	BU (FCI NUIE	17.2(0)	1.		
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic The translation of the foreign language provisiona	Langlication	has bee	n received.		
a)	la at a place for democracy	priority unde	er 35 U.S	S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
15)∟		priority und				
	ment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (I	PTO-413) Paper No(s)		
	Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of	informal Pa	tent Application (PTO-152)		
	Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3 and 5	6) Other:				
73'						

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/892,860

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

- 1. Claims 1, and 3-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The step of treating the screened water through the membrane is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 is unclear as to whether the waste water to be treated by the system is first treated by the screen and further the treated water is filtered by a membrane in the system. The step of treating by a membrane, producing a permeate and retentate is not included in the claims and the claims are therefore incomplete. Claim 6 is unclear as to what is intended. The term "mixed liquor" in the claims is unclear as to whether permeate, retentate or waste water feed stream is intended.
 - 3. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 18, 19 recites the limitation ""mixed liquor" in lines 5 and 6 of claim 1, line 2 of claims 5-6, and 10, 18-19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.